

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. Claims 1-9 stand rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1-7 have been amended. The amendments made to the claims do not alter the scope of these claims, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to the claims have been made to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Claims 2-4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In light of the Examiner's remarks, claims 2 and 6 have been amended to recite a first and a second address pool as well as a first and second radio-relay station. Further, Applicants have amended the claims substituting the word "renewed" with "updated". In light of these amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,946,633 ("McAlinden"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must disclose every element of the claim, as arranged in the claim, and in sufficient detail to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the anticipated subject matter. See, PPG Industries, Inc. v. Guardian Industries Corp., 75 F.3d 1558, 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1996); C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc., 157 F.3d 1340, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1998). A

reference that does not expressly disclose all of the elements of a claimed invention cannot anticipate unless all of the undisclosed elements are inherently present in the reference. See, Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 942 F.2d 1264, 1268 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Among the limitations of independent claims 1 and 5 not present in McAlinden is the radio station preserving said address pool and assigning a second work address belonging to said address pool to said wireless terminal. Likewise, McAlinden fails to teach the step of notifying said radio relay station being connected to said radio relay terminating station in said wireless manner of an address pool making up part of said plurality of network addresses and a step of assigning a network address belonging to said address pool to said wireless terminal being connected to said radio station in a wireless manner. The Office Action asserts that the remaining limitations in claims 1 and 5 are disclosed in the McAlinden reference. However, McAlinden fails to disclose at least the above-recited features. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Further, McAlinden's object is to achieve high speed communication using low speed links. To accomplish this, when an HBCD terminal requires more data bandwidth, the HBCD server transmits secondary MINs to the HBCD terminal. The HBCD terminal thereby establishes a 1st and 2nd connection using the secondary MINs, and the HBCD terminal communicates with DATA SOURCES by using both 1st and 2nd connection.

Additionally, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that the HBCD terminal corresponds to a radio-relay station and an MCO corresponds to a radio-relay terminating station. If so, the HBCD terminal cannot receive an address pool from the MCO and the HBCD terminal cannot assign an address to a personal computer from its address pool. In addition, an MCO has a plurality of MINs (equal to a phone number, i.e. (512)-933-7XYZ). However, these MINs are never assigned to personal computers because the link between the HBCD terminal and the personal computer is different than the link between the HBCD terminal and the MCO. Therefore, the HBCD terminal doesn't correspond to a radio-relay station. It should be noted that McAlinden fails to teach that a cell site is assigned a network address from an MCO and that it has an address pool and assigns network addresses to the HBCD terminal.

Accordingly, for these additional reasons, the claimed invention is clearly patentably distinguishable over the McAlinden reference.

Claims 2-4 depend either directly or indirectly from, and contain all the limitations of claim 1. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested by McAlinden and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 2-4 should also be allowed.

Claims 6-9 depend either directly or indirectly from, and contain all the limitations of claim 5. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 5, are neither disclosed nor

suggested by McAlinden and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 6-9 should also be allowed.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: February 25, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 835-1400  
Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs